



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,942	01/30/2004	William Robert Wilson	3911-21	4280

23117 7590 06/25/2008

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

SUTTON, DARRYL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1612

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/766,942

Applicant(s)

WILSON ET AL.

Examiner

DARRYL C. SUTTON

Art Unit

1612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-73 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12 and 19-73 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-18 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date (3 in all).
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Applicant should include all priority data on the first page of the specification.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group IX, and election of species, Formula I, Z=N, (d) $Y_1=Y_2=H$, (e) N-oxide position=1, (f) $X=NH$ and (g) $A=CH_2CH_2N(CH_3)_2$ along with claims 13-18 in the reply filed on 1/22/2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Claims 1-12 and 19-73 are withdrawn as not being drawn to the elected species.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

Art Unit: 1612

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (U.S. Patent 6,362,184).

The claims are drawn to a compound of Formula I, wherein $Z=N$; $Y_1=Y_2=H$; N-oxide position=1; $X=NH$ and $A=CH_2CH_2N(CH_3)_2$.

Lee et al. discloses a compound represented by the structural Formula I, wherein $Y_1=Y_2=H$; N-oxide position=1; $X=NHCH_2CH_2CH_2N(CH_2CH_3)_2$ (column 21, lines 35-42, compound 18). Lee also discloses compounds of Formula I, wherein $X=NHR$, wherein the various R groups are independently selected from lower alkyl (1-4C) and may themselves be substituted with dialkyl (1-4C) tertiary amino groups (column 3, lines 1-25). The compounds are mono or dioxides of substituted 1,2,4 benotriazines as set forth in Formula I and used in the method of selectively killing hypoxic tumor cells (column 3, lines 55-60, Abstract, column 2, lines 40-50).

The instant application differs from Lee et al. at:

(a) the length of the alkyl group bonded to X, applicant's $(CH_2)_2$ versus $(CH_2)_3$ of Lee et al.; and (b) the length of the alkyl groups of the tertiary amino moiety, applicant's CH_3 versus (CH_2CH_3) of Lee et al. Therefore, Lee et al. does not teach the specific compound disclosed in claims 13-18.

The reference is not anticipatory insofar as one must "pick and choose" from different lists of Y₁, Y₂, mono or dioxide and X. That being said, it would have been obvious in a self-evident manner to have selected H, H, mono-oxide from one list and NHCH₂CH₂N(CH₃)₂ from another, motivated by the unambiguous disclosure of each individually, and consistent with the basic principle of patent prosecution that a reference should be considered as expansively as is reasonable in determining the full scope of the contents within its four corners.

MPEP 2144.09 states: Compounds which are homologs (compounds differing regularly by the successive addition of the same chemical group, e.g., by -CH₂- groups) are generally sufficiently close structural similarity that there is a presumed expectation that such compounds possess similar properties. In re Wilder, 563 F.2d 457, 195 USPQ 426 (CCPA 1977).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Lee et al. to make compounds of Formula I cited in claims 13-18 of the instant application motivated by the teachings of Lee et al. that such compounds would be beneficial as radiosensitizers and selective cytotoxic agents.

All claims are rejected.

Conclusion

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 1612

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Darryl C. Sutton whose telephone number is (571)270-3286. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th from 7:30AM-5:00PM EST and on Fr from 7:30AM-4:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick Krass can be reached at (571)272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/Darryl C Sutton/
Examiner, Art Unit 1612

/Frederick Krass/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612